

REMARKS

Claims 1-60 are pending in the present application.

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed July 19, 2007. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicant has amended claims 1, 17, 31, and 47 for the purpose of clarification of the present invention only. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected: 1) claims 1-7, 9-21, 23-37, 39-51 and 53-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,172,677 issued to Stautner et al. ("Stautner") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,801,747 issued to Bedard ("Bedard") and further in view of U.S. No. 5,710,605 issued to Nelson ("Nelson"); 2) claims 1, 2, 8, 17, 18, 22, 31, 32, 38, 47, 48 and 52 as being unpatentable over Stautner in view of Bedard, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,130,726 issued to Darbee et al. ("Darbee"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the following reasons.

Stautner discloses an electronic program guide (EPG) comprising a plurality of columns and rows (col. 4, lines 29-27) ... The Examiner claimed that Stautner discloses "displaying in a first cell formed at an intersection of a first row and a first column, program information for a first program associated with a first source (Fig. 4 – CNN, channel 22). Applicant disagrees. In contrast to the present invention, Stautner does not disclose displaying, in its first cell, program information, but a first source (i.e., Fig. 4, CNN, channel 22). Applicant, however, agrees that Stautner

does display program information, but the program information is not displayed in the first cell. The present invention, on the other hand, claims “displaying in the first cell, the program information” (Fig. 3, Saturday Night Live). Displaying in the first cell the “program information” is clearly distinguishable over displaying the first “source”, and that is exactly what it is claimed in the present invention. Moreover, in the present invention, the program information is the title-based information and the first source being one of channel and category. Unlike Stautner, the first source in the present invention is not displayed on the EPG.

Bedard discloses a viewer profile where the viewer’s viewing behavior to determine the viewer’s preferred channels and the types or categories of television programming that the viewer prefers on those channels... The viewer profile can also be used to identify and provide information of interest from the internet. (Col. 3, line 33-56). In view of the amendment to the claims, the reference cited (i.e., Bedard) by the Examiner is now moot.

Nelson discloses a remote control unit for controlling a television and videocassette recorder with a display (Fig. 1). The display mechanism is included for displaying the current day and time and for further displaying television programming schedule items (Col. 2, lines 2-5). Nelson, however, does not disclose displaying program information for a first program associated with a first source in a first cell and that the program information being title-based information and the first source being one of a channel and category.

Darbee discloses a program guide on a remote control display (Figs 1-14). The programming of the remote control has the capability to vary the size of the font(s), as this will enable users to obtain information more quickly. Similarly, provision is made for the utilization of different character sets and languages on the

display of the remote control (Col. 10, lines 51-59). Unlike the present invention, Darbee does not disclose displaying program information for a first program in a first cell, and that the program information being title-based information and the first source being one of a channel and category.

Stautner, Bedard, Nelson, and Darbee, taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose, suggest, or render obvious, the displaying of program information a first program associated with a first source displayed in a first cell, and the program information being title-based information and the first source being one of a channel and category. This aspect of the invention is supported in the specification on paragraphs [0003], [0004], [0008], [0012], [0025], [0026], [0046], [0063] and [0072], figures 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and is recited in amended claims 1, 17, 31, 47.

Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 17, 31, 47 and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully solicited. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 04-1175.

Respectfully submitted,

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES

Dated: _____

09/19/07



Caroline T. Do, Esq.
Reg. No. 47,529

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT
2265 E. 220th Street
Long Beach, CA 90810
(310) 952-3300